

Remarks

The numbered paragraphs of the Office action are responded to through the corresponding numbered paragraphs below. The applicant has addressed each issue in turn and, for clarity, has provided a heading for each issue.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The Examiner provided the citation to the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The applicant believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.
2. The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 12-14 "under 36 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement." The applicant has requested that claim 1 be amended to clarify that the pad pressure adjustment is attached within the frame as shown in figure 5 and described in paragraph 0059. The applicant believes that this requested amendment is fully responsive to the rejection of this paragraph and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The Examiner provided the reference to sections in Title 35, US Code provided in the prior Office action. The applicant believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.
4. The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thatcher et al., in view of Nagayama et al., Warren et al. and Wulff. The applicant has requested that claim 1, on which claims 2-8 and 11-14 be amended to point out that applicant's invention includes a single large buffer pad located behind the scrubber and near the rear of the frame. The location of the buffer pad facilitates the

simultaneous scrubbing and buffing operation of this device, while the large buffer pad provides consistent buffing of the scrubbed surface while eliminating the possibility of a region between buffing pads that can remain unbuffed. Although, the references cited by the Examiner disclose buffers and scrubbers, the applicant believes that the particular configuration of the buffers and scrubbers of this invention is new, non-obvious and provides exceptional advantages over machines having a single buffer/polisher, having a cleaning brush, or having multiple buffer pads. The applicant believes applicant's invention provides the simultaneous scrubbing and buffing, with improved buffing that is not found, described or suggested by the cited or any other known references, either alone or in combination. Since claims 2-8 and 12-14 depend on claim 1, they include the limitations of claim 1. Therefore the applicant believes that this requested amendment, in combination with the other elements/limitations of the claims is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Response to Arguments

5. The Examiner noted that the "Applicant's arguments filed 3/17/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive." The applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration and believes that no specific response is required for this paragraph.

Conclusion


6. The Examiner indicated that this action is made final and reminded the applicant of the statutory period for reply. The applicant is responding to this "final" action with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). The applicant is filing this response by Express Mail within the permitted extension period with the required Petition for

Extension of Time and fee. Accordingly, the applicant kindly requests entry of this response and continued examination.

The Examiner has provided information concerning communication and/or inquiries concerning this case. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to communicate and assistance regarding this case and believes no response to this paragraph is necessary.

The applicant has requested that claim 1 be amended as previously described. The applicant therefore believes that all issues and points of the Examiner's Office action have been addressed. Applicant believes that the pending claims 1-8 and 12-14 including the amended claim 1, are patentable over all known prior art. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted this 21st day of October, 2004.



Lloyd W. Sadler, Reg. No. 40,154
SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.
15 West South Temple, Suite 1200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
Telephone: (801) 257-1900
Facsimile: (801) 257-1800